



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/960,431	10/29/97	SUGIYAMA	M 30598.0004

QM12/0712

TROY M SCHMELZER  
SNELL & WILMER  
ONE ARIZONA CENTER  
PHOENIX AZ 85004-0001

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED: 07/12/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/960,431

Applicant(s)

Sugayama et al.

Examiner

Nguyen

Group Art Unit

3723



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 08/421,706.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 1

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3723

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Reissue Applications*

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because none of the errors which are relied upon to support the reissue application are errors upon which a reissue can be based. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414.
2. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to contain a statement that all errors which are being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath/declaration arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414.
3. The reissue oath or declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to particularly specify the errors and/or how the errors relied upon arose or occurred as required under 37 CFR 1.175(a)(5). Included are inadvertent errors in conduct, i.e., actions taken by the applicant, the attorney or others, before the original patent issued, which are alleged to be the cause of the actual errors in the patent. This includes how and when the errors in conduct arose or occurred, as well as how and when these errors were discovered. Applicant's attention is directed to *Hewlett-Packard v. Bausch&Lomb*, 11 USPQ2d 1750, 1758 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The declaration

Art Unit: 3723

does not state how these errors arose. It states in paragraph 5 no claims drawn to "such and such" were presented, but it does not state the why and the how these errors were not presented.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the Declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose et al.'986 in view of Jackson et al.'627.

With reference to Figs. 1-3, column 4, line 25 bridging to column 6, line 32, Hirose discloses the claimed invention except for explicitly disclosing the dressing being done during polishing.

With reference to Figs. 1-5, column 2, line 44 bridging to column 5, line 11, Jackson et al.'627 discloses conditioner for a polishing pad. Specifically, in column 5, lines 10-14, Jackson

Art Unit: 3723

discloses that the conditioning of pad 20 may alternately take place while the device surface of wafer 70 is being polished or while it is not being polished.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the operating method of Hirose with the conditioning of the polishing cloth while the wafer is being polished as taught by Jackson to maintain the integrity of the polishing cloth in-situ to improve the planarity of the wafer surface.

### *Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cesna et al.' 131 discloses a device of conditioning polishing pads.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-0163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM-3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr.

Scherbel, can be reached at (703) 308-1272. The fax number for this Group is (703) 305-3579.

An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1148.

**George Nguyen**  
**Patent Examiner**

George Nguyen

7/1/99

